



WESTMONT

Program Review Committee

MEMORANDUM -- DRAFT

Date: March 27, 2021
To: Rachel Winslow, Committee Chair
Re: 2020 Annual Assessment Report

Thank you for your submission of the 2019-2020 Annual Assessment report, which we read with great interest and appreciation for your good work. We are pleased to see that the GE Committee is taking assessment seriously and making significant strides towards helping students learn better.

Your report was evaluated using the Rubric for Evaluating Annual Assessment Reports [posted on the PRC website](#) by two committee members, Bill Nelson and Elizabeth Gardner. While assessing your report, the assessors made the comments presented on pp. 1-3 of this response. It is our goal that all departments should reach the “Developed” level of achievement on all the seven criteria, or be making progress toward this level. Except for “Style,” your committee has accomplished this goal, and both assessors awarded you the “Highly-Developed” rating in Methods of Assessment and in Completeness rubric categories, which is excellent!

The committee would like to commend your department for a) focusing on factual knowledge in the assessment of the RS Common Context Courses and b) developing a helpful rubric for assessing the five areas selected for this report.

While assessing your report, the assessors made the following comments:

Previous PRC’s Recommendations: Average Score – 3

- The report deals adequately with the CUPA recommendation and the assessment of RS Common Context courses. Discussions about the language requirement, the senior survey, and the PEA courses will continue.

Quality of Evidence and Measuring Instruments: Average Score – 3

- Regarding the RS assessment, the report recognizes the limits of the surveys to more factual knowledge. We encourage the GE Committee and RS Department to seek ways to evaluate other areas more, such as interpretation.
- Regarding Reading Imaginative Literature, as acknowledged on p. 10, it would be helpful to see some model essays that demonstrate success against the rubric. Also, the professors doing the

assessment are encouraged to have norming sessions to ensure that they are evaluating the essays in comparable ways (as suggested on p. 10).

Methods of Assessment: Average Score – 4

- As mentioned above, the biblical literacy survey developed by the Religious Studies Department was a successful tool. Also the rubric developed for English, Modern Languages, and Theatre Arts was an effective instrument.

Use of Evidence: Average Score – 3.5

- On the surface, there was not always a clear alignment between the Religious Studies survey and the proposed changes. There could be more of a discussion about how to improve courses based on the survey. For instance, could specific developments be tied to specific elements in the assessment data?
- The discussion among the professors in English, Modern Languages, and Theatre Arts about genre and whether it should be removed in future assessments demonstrates good use of evidence.

Completeness: Average Score – 4

- The report was complete and everything was in place including appendices.

Style: Average Score – 2.75

- There were a number of typos: p. 1 “GR program,” “will allow students reach” [should be “to reach”], “the concept of competency requirement” [should be “a competency requirement”]; p. 5 the last bullet point “Beyond the GE classes . . .” repeats what was on pp. 4 and 5 (Dr. Farhadian and Dr. Rhee); p. 6 “Classes participated” [should be “Classes which participated”]; p. 9 “the reasons of these disparities” [should be “the reasons for these disparities”; “whether or whether”]; p. 10 “even the SLO” [should be “even though the SLO.”].

Evidence of Collaboration and Communication: Average Score -- 3

- The RS department demonstrated strength here in creating the survey. There could be a richer discussion of how to make progress on weaknesses.
- There seems to be good collaboration in the English Department, but there was not as much participation by the Modern Languages and Theatre Arts Departments.

Summary of the PRC’s recommendations:

- Encourage the Religious Studies department to do more work on assessing additional elements of biblical literacy like interpretation.

- Encourage the English, Modern Languages, and Theatre Arts departments to include sample essays.
- Encourage the RS department to discuss the changes they will make based on the assessment tool.
- Encourage more collaboration with the Modern Languages and Theatre Arts departments.

Thank you again for your good work, GE Committee Colleagues! If you wish to discuss this memo or to discuss and finalize the current PRC's response to your annual report, please contact either Bill Nelson or Elizabeth Gardner and we will schedule a meeting. If we have not heard from you by April 25, 2021, we will consider this "draft" memo final.